

**REMARKS**

Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested in view of the following remarks. Applicants respectfully submit that the claims as presented are in condition for allowance. Prior to entry of this response, Claims 1, 3-4, 6-8, and 12-18 were present in the application, of which Claims 1, 8, and 17 are independent. In the Final Office Action dated March 25, 2008, Claim 3 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112 and Claims 1, 3-4, 6-8, and 12-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b). Following this response, Claims 1, 4, 6-8, 12-13, and 15-18 remain in this application with Claims 3 and 14 being canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Applicant hereby addresses the Examiner's rejections in turn.

I. Interview Summary

Applicants thank Examiners Anwari for the courtesy of a telephone interview on July 1, 2008, requested by the undersigned to discuss the rejection of the current claims under 35 U.S.C. § 102. During the interview, Applicants asserted that the cited references do not anticipate the claims as currently amended. The Examiner indicated the currently amended claims appear to overcome the cited references and a further search of the art is needed. No agreement was reached regarding patentability.

II. Rejection of Claim 3 Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph

In the Final Office Action dated March 25, 2007, the Examiner rejected Claim 3 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the Applicants regard as their invention. Claim 3 has been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer rendering this rejection moot.

III. Rejection of Claims 1-20 Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

In the Office Action, Claims 1-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by "Outlook 2000 in a Nutshell" ("Syroid"). Claims 1, 8, and 17 have been amended, and Applicants respectfully submit that the amendments overcome this rejection and add no new matter.

Amended Claim 1 is patentably distinguishable over the cited art for at least the reason that it recites, for example, "receiving a selection in the first dialog box, wherein the received selection being configured to indicate the at least one of the plurality of rules the user has selected for editing, and in response to receiving the selection in the first dialog box, displaying a second user interface dialog box comprising: a list identifying each of the at least one electronic messages indicating which of the at least one condition that has been satisfied, wherein the at least one of the plurality of rules the user has selected for editing is highlighted and, a text box containing the list, the text box configured to allow the user to edit the at least one of the plurality of rules that is highlighted." Amended Claims 8 and 17 each includes a similar recitation. Support for

these amendments can be found in the specification at least on page 9, line 15-page 10, line 13.

In contrast, *Syroid* at least does not disclose the aforementioned recitation from Claim 1. For example, *Syroid* discloses a rules wizard command opening a dialog box. (See page 4 and Figure 6-14.) Defined rules are displayed in an upper pain of the dialog box. (See page 4 and Figure 6-14.) In *Syroid*, a description is provided that details what a rule does and conditions that trigger the rule. (See page 4.) Clicking on an underlined value allows a user to edit the underlined value via the same dialogs used to define the underlined value originally. (See page 4.) *Syroid* defines the underlined values using check boxes and drop down menus. (See pages 7-10 and Figures 6-15, 6-16, and 6-17.) Accordingly, *Syroid* merely discloses check boxes and drop down menus for use in editing values. Consequently, *Syroid* does not disclose using a text box to allow a user to edit rules. Rather *Syroid* merely discloses edit values in the same way they are defined. In addition, *Syroid* is silent regarding text boxes.

*Syroid* does not anticipate the claimed invention because *Syroid* at least does not disclose “receiving a selection in the first dialog box, wherein the received selection being configured to indicate the at least one of the plurality of rules the user has selected for editing, and in response to receiving the selection in the first dialog box, displaying a second user interface dialog box comprising: a list identifying each of the at least one electronic messages indicating which of the at least one condition that has been satisfied, wherein the at least one of the plurality of rules the user has selected for editing is highlighted and, a text box containing the list, the text box configured to allow

the user to edit the at least one of the plurality of rules that is highlighted,” as recited by amended Claim 1. Amended Claims 8 and 17 each includes a similar recitation.

Furthermore, amended Claim 1 is patentably distinguishable over the cited art for at least the reason that it recites, for example, “wherein at least one of the plurality of rules is a default rule provided with the personal information manager.” Amended Claim 8 includes a similar recitation. Amended Claim 17 is patentably distinguishable over the cited art for at least the reason that it recites, for example, “storing within the electronic mail message client at least one user-defined message handling rule and at least one rule that provided by a system administrator.” Support for these amendments can be found in the specification at least on page 8, lines 2-4.

In contrast, *Syroid* at least does not disclose the aforementioned recitation from Claim 1. For example, *Syroid* merely discloses user created rules. (See pages 4-20.) Consequently, *Syroid* does not disclose default rules or rules established by a system administrator. Rather *Syroid* merely discloses implementing a rule at a preset time.

*Syroid* does not anticipate the claimed invention because *Syroid* at least does not disclose “wherein at least one of the plurality of rules is a default rule provided with the personal information manager,” as recited by amended Claim 1. Amended Claim 8 includes a similar recitation. *Syroid* does not anticipate Claim 17 because *Syroid* at least does not disclose “storing within the electronic mail message client at least one user-defined message handling rule and at least one rule that provided by a system administrator.” Accordingly, independent Claims 1, and 8, and 17 each patentably distinguishes the present invention over the cited art, and Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection of Claims 1, 8, and 17.

Dependent Claims 4, 6-7, 12-13, 15-16, and 18 are also allowable at least for the reasons described above regarding independent Claims 1, 8, and 17, and by virtue of their respective dependencies upon independent Claims 1, 8, and 17. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection of dependent Claims 4, 6-7, 12-13, 15-16, and 18.

#### IV. Conclusion

Applicants respectfully request that this Amendment After Final be entered by the Examiner, placing the claims in condition for allowance. Applicants respectfully submit that the proposed amendments of the claims do not raise new issues or necessitate the undertaking of any additional search of the art by the Examiner, since all of the elements and their relationships claimed were either earlier claimed or inherent in the claims as examined. Therefore, this Amendment should allow for immediate action by the Examiner.

Finally, Applicants respectfully submit that the entry of the Amendment would place the application in better form for appeal, should the Examiner dispute the patentability of the pending claims.

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that the claimed invention, as amended, is neither anticipated nor rendered obvious in view of the prior art references cited against this application. Applicants therefore request the entry of this Amendment, the Examiner's reconsideration and reexamination of the application, and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that the pending claims, as amended, are patentable over the cited references. The preceding arguments are based only on the arguments in the Final Official Action, and therefore do not address patentable aspects of the invention that were not addressed by the Examiner in the Final Official Action. The claims may include other elements that are not shown, taught, or suggested by the cited art. Accordingly, the preceding argument in favor of patentability is advanced without prejudice to other bases of patentability. Furthermore, the Final Office Action contains a number of statements reflecting characterizations of the related art and the claims. Regardless of whether any such statement is identified herein, Applicants decline to automatically subscribe to any statement or characterization in the Final Office Action.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 13-2725.

Respectfully submitted,  
MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.

P.O. Box 2903  
Minneapolis, MN 55402-0903  
404.954.5066

/D. Kent Stier/

Date: July 25, 2008

---

D. Kent Stier  
Reg. No. 50,640

DKS:mdc

**27488**

PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE